



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

MU

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/038,982	01/04/2002	Mark Albert	062891.0613	9525
5073	7590	09/07/2006	EXAMINER	
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P. 2001 ROSS AVENUE SUITE 600 DALLAS, TX 75201-2980			WANG, LIANG CHE A	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2155	

DATE MAILED: 09/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/038,982	ALBERT ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Liang-che Alex Wang	2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 July 2006.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action responds to amendment filed on 7/24/2006.
2. Claims 1-31 are presented for examination.
3. Claims 1, 11, 16, 24 and 29 have been amended.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 7/24/2006, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
5. In that remarks, applicant's argues in substance:

That: neither the Farris, et al., or Griffiths patents discloses a capability to assign a net work location to a user for a communication session from a range of network location information as required in the claimed invention (page 12 remark).

This is not found persuasive because Farris et al., as indicated in previous action, clearly teaches central office assigns a register and a office equipment number to the off-hook line, so the SSP central office could identify caller's line by the office equipment number and the telephone number associated with the off-hook line (page 18 lines 7-35). SSP central office corresponds to the first network interface; register, OE number and telephone number corresponds to the network location address; telephone 1A corresponds to the network user, and off-hook line for communication between telephone and SSP central office corresponds to the communication session. And the newly added limitation from

a range of network location is an indefinite limitation, the examiner give the broadest interpretation that OE number must be assigned within a finite range of numbers which covers the limitation “a range of network locator addresses”.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 1-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
8. Referring to claim 1, 11, 16, 24 and 29, claims 1, 11, 16, 24, and 29 recites the limitation “from a range of network locator addresses”, it is unclear to the examiner how “a range” of “a range of network locator addresses” is defined, which renders the claim vague and indefinite.
9. All dependent claims are rejected to as having the same deficiencies as the claims they depend from.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 1-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Farris et al., US Patent Number 6,122,357, hereinafter Farris, in views of Griffiths, US Patent Number 6,950,508, hereinafter Griffiths.
12. Referring to claim 1, Farris teaches a system for communicating user identification information over a communications network, comprising:
 - a. a first network interface (figure 1 SSP) operable to establish a communication session with a network user (Col 18 lines 7-10, figure 1, user 1A), the first network interface (Col 18 lines 14-18, 22-27, central office assigns a register and OE number to the off-hook line) operable to assign the network user (1A) a network locator address (register and OE number corresponds to the network locator address) for the communication session (off-line session between telephone 1A and central office 11 is a communication session)(Col 18 lines 22-36) from a range of network locator addresses (OE number must fall into a finite range of available OE numbers);
 - b. a second network interface (figure 1, IP 23) operable to process a request sent by the user (Col 9 lines 41-47), in the communication session (figure 4A steps 10-11), the request forwarded by the first network interface and includes the network locator address of the network user (see figure 5, step 38, telephone is connected with IP, so IP is aware of the telephones connected to it. Telephone address in this example is a network locator address), the second network interface operable to determine if an identity of the network user associated with the network locator

address is stored in a local memory of the second network interface (figure 4 A steps S12-S13, Col 19 line 52- Col 20 line 15), the second network interface operable to obtain additional information about the network user in response to the identity of the network user being stored in the local memory (steps S14-S15, Col 20 lines 24-32), the second network interface operable to process the request according to the additional information (IP terminates the operation (as processing the request) according to the obtaining the additional information).

Farris does not teach the first network interface operable to authenticate an identity of a network user.

However, Griffiths teaches SSP (as first network interface in Farris) is capable of authenticate telephone subscribers (as identity of a network user in Farris)(see Col 3 lines 55-58, and Col 5 lines 21-24.)

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the user identity authentication in SSP of Griffiths in Farris such that to have Farris's telephone subscriber being authenticated at the first network interface because both Farris and Griffiths teaches telephoning system with SSP and STP functions.

A person with ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make the modification to Farris because having the user to be authenticated in SSP would prevent unauthorized use of service to occur a taught by Griffiths.

13. Referring to claim 5, Farris as modified further teaches wherein the second network interface is operable to store the identity of the network user in the local memory and

associated the identity of the network user with the network locator address (Col 20 lines 6-9, Col 10 lines 63-67).

14. Referring to claim 6, Farris as modified further teaches wherein the network is an Internet Protocol network and the network locator address is an Internet Protocol address (Col 8 lines 12-14, states Farris' system can be utilized in Internet network, each user could be an Internet based user, and each Internet based user would then have an IP address associated with it in a TCP/IP network.)

15. Referring to claim 7 Farris as modified further teaches wherein the additional information about the network user includes at least one service to be performed on the request (Col 20 lines 32-49.)

16. Referring to claim 8, Farris as modified further teaches wherein the at least one service to be performed on the request includes rating and filtering content of an exchange of information with the network user associated with the request (Col 20 lines 32-49.)

17. Referring to claim 9, Farris as modified further teaches wherein the second network interface associated with the request, the network locator address, and the identity of the network user with the first network interface (figure 4A, steps S12-S15, and Col 10lines 63-67.)

18. Referring to claim 10, Farris as modified further teaches wherein the first network interface provides the second network interface with an association of the identity of the network user with the network locator address upon establishing the communication session steps figure 4A steps S1-S10.)

19. Referring to claims 11-16, 20-24, 26-37, claims 11-16, 20-24, 26-37 encompass the same scope of the invention as that of the claims 1, 5-10. Therefore, claims 11-16, 20-24, 26-37 are rejected for the same reason as the claims 1, 5-10.
20. Referring to claim 2 and 3, Farris as modified teaches a system as described in claim 1, and Farris has taught the step of determining that there is no network user identity associated with the network locator address of the network user stored in the local memory (Col 24 line 66 – Col 25 line 1), Farris does not explicitly teach the step of providing the network user identity (from the user or first NT interface) to the second network interface in response to a query.

However, for a system having stored data in the second network interface to match with incoming requests, there must be ways to have the stored data being stored in order to be compared in the future. The stored data would not exist without being provided from the system. In Farris system, the first network interface SSP is the central office (see figure 1), which manages all users associated data and also works as the head of the system (Col 9 lines 35-67). Therefore, if the stored data in the second network interface is being provided somehow, it must be provided from either the central office or from the user itself.

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the first network interface and the user to provide the user identity to the second network interface because the stored user data would not exist itself, but must be provided from the system and the user data is definitely provided from the user originally.

A person with ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make the modification to Farris because sending the query to the obtain the user identification provides a way for Farris system to update it's stored user data in the second user interface.

21. Referring to claim 4, Farris as modified further teaches wherein the second network interface is operable to authenticate the identity of the network user received from the first network interface (Col 11 line 65 – Col 20 line 5.)
22. Referring to claims 17-19 and 25, claims 17-19 and 25 encompass the same scope of the invention as that of the claims 2-4. Therefore, claims 17-19 and 25 are rejected for the same reason as the claims 2-4.

Conclusion

23. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).
24. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

25. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Liang-che Alex Wang whose telephone number is (571)272-3992. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday, 8:30 am to 5:00 pm.
26. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571)272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.
27. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Liang-che Alex Wang 
August 31, 2006



SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER